

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 8-17, and 19-30 are pending in the present application.

Claim Objection

In the final Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 2, line 10, the phrase "electric device" and requested that it be changed to "electronic device" as used elsewhere within the claims. Applicants have amended Claim 2 accordingly.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the final Office Action, Claims 2-6, 8-17, and 19-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,283,789 to Tsai (hereinafter "Tsai"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims and submit the following. In this regard, applicants have canceled some of the claims, so the remaining claims for the Examiner's review are Claims 2-6, 8-17, and 19-23, of which Claims 2, 3, and 4 are independent claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 3, and 4, as amended, are allowable in view of Tsai.

Specifically, the Examiner noted in rejecting Claim 2 that the Examiner was not convinced by applicants' previous argument that Tsai fails to teach or suggest "control means that performs on-control of said power supply control means only when the supply of a predetermined electronic power through each of said at least two ports of the interface is permitted as a result of communication between said control means and external equipment." In the remarks, the Examiner noted that "Tsai does not go into detail about the control means as it is quite clear that it is *inherent* to the system of a device that utilizes the second USB cable having a proper control means to observe the USB and IEEE1394 standards." (Emphasis added.) Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's inherency argument in this case is not well founded. "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that *it would*

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." *In re Robertson*, 49 U.S.P.Q.2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999), cited in M.P.E.P. § 2112. (Emphasis added.)

Although the Examiner may be correct in noting that a "control means" is necessarily present when utilizing a USB or IEEE1394 interface, the control means that turns on the power supply control means to thereby permit operation of the electronic device *only when* the supply of predetermined electric power through *each of at least two ports of the interface* is confirmed (e.g., only when both of the two cables are connected to the electronic device) is *not* necessarily present or inherent. In fact, Tsai merely describes a pair of USB cables, and does not disclose or suggest any function of an *electronic device* to which the USB cables are to be connected. As such, Tsai cannot possibly disclose or suggest any "control means" within an electronic device, which determines whether both of the cables are connected to the electronic device on the basis of the result of communication with an external equipment, and based on the determination controls the power supply to the electronic device to thereby turn on the electronic device.

In this connection, Claims 2, 3, and 4 have been amended, as above, to more specifically recite the subject matter that applicants consider as their invention. Specifically, all of these claims recite that the electronic device is turned on, or functions thereof become fully available "only when the supply of predetermined electric power through each of said at least two ports of the interface is confirmed," as a result of [or on the basis of the result of] "communication" between "said control means" and "the external equipment." As discussed above, Tsai does not at all teach or suggest any means within an electronic device for determining whether "the supply of predetermined electric power through each of said at least two ports of the interface is

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

confirmed," let alone performing some function based on the determination, as explicitly recited in each of Claims 2, 3, and 4.


Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that Examiner's reconsider the present application to conclude that Claims 2, 3, and 4, as amended, are allowable in view of Tsai, because Tsai fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in Claims 2, 3, and 4.

Claims 5-6, 8-17, and 19-23 are all dependent from amended Claims 2, 3, and 4, and therefore these dependent claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons why amended Claims 2, 3, and 4 are allowable.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner allow the present application including Claims 2-6, 8-17, and 19-23. If the Examiner should have further issues to resolve, he is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Shoko I. Leek
Registration No. 43,746
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1780

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date:

August 30, 2005

Shoko Leek

SIL:jeh

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100